



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/675,235	09/30/2003	Jeffrey Raymond Reihl	73715-331389	9832
35657	7590	04/21/2009	EXAMINER	
FAEGRE & BENSON LLP			LY, CHEYNE D	
PATENT DOCKETING - INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2200 WELLS FARGO CENTER				
90 SOUTH SEVENTH STREET			2168	
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-3901				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/21/2009		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

e-OfficeActionHNI@faegre.com
dweiss@faegre.com

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/675,235	REIHL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CHEYNE D. LY	2168	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) CHEYNE D. LY. (3) _____.

(2) Soumya Panda for Applicant. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 15 April 2009.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: _____.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant described the claimed invention and asserts the cited prior art, Chowdhry et al., does not describe the limitation of "said electronic information product..." recited in the last 3 lines of claim 1. Examiner pointed to [0257] of the cited portion of Chowdhry to suggest that "a message" could reasonably be interpreted as an "electronic information product".

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Cheyne D Ly/
Examiner, Art Unit 2168